

Applic. No. 10/647,542
Amdt. dated November 14, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 14, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 14 2006

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, and 25-27 remain in the application.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Claims 7, 8, and 28 are being cancelled herewith. Claims 3, 4, 10, 12-24, and 26-27 have been withdrawn from consideration.

In item 3 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, the Examiner stated that a new title is required that is indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The title has been amended to comply with the Examiner's request.

In item 4 on page 2 of the Office action, claims 2, 7, and 11 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Examiner stated that in claim 2, "beam thermal/kinetic" is confusing. Claim 2 has been amended so as to further clarify the claim. Therefore, the rejection of claim 2 is believed to have been overcome.

Applic. No. 10/647,542
Amdt. dated November 14, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 14, 2006

In claim 7, the Examiner requests clarification as to if this is an addition step or if it describes the "treating step".

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 7 and has been further clarified so as to indicate that this is part of the "treating step". Therefore, the rejection of claim 7 is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner stated that with respect to claim 11, it is unclear how the material structure is being "varied". Claim 11 has been amended so as to further clarify how the material structure is varied. Therefore, the rejection of claim 11 is believed to have been overcome. Support for the change to claim 11 is found in the second paragraph on page 17 of the specification.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic or clarificatory reasons. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art nor for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

Applic. No. 10/647,542
Amdt. dated November 14, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 14, 2006

In item 5 on page 3 of the Office action, claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, and 25 have been rejected as being obvious over Wojewnik (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0139472 A1), Wojewnik et al. (WO-99/50099), or Davis Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,889) (hereinafter "Davis") in view of Cado (U.S. Patent No. 3,042,591) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The rejections have been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found in claims 7 and 8 and on page 39, line 12 to page 40, line 9 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

applying a germination layer to the profile provided for the conductor run with the higher adhesion, by one of the steps of applying a powder to the surface and drawing the motor vehicle molding through a powder bath, causing the powder to only adhere to the profile provided for the conductor run.

Applic. No. 10/647,542
Amdt. dated November 14, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 14, 2006

The Wojewnik and Wojewnik et al. references disclose that a mask is applied for producing the conductor track, where the mask has the conductor track pattern. The conductor track material is then applied by a thermal spraying.

The Davis reference discloses coating of ribs without the use of mask. The construction of the ribs allows the electrical traces to be provided without a mask.

Cado discloses a conventional multi-step method as is customary in the production of printed circuit boards. Cado discloses that grooves (11) are formed in an insulating panel (10) (Fig. 2). The entire panel is subsequently coated with the silver layer (12) (Fig. 3). Finally, a resist (28) is applied to the elevated regions (Fig. 4). The entire panel is subsequently immersed into an electrolyte bath (Fig. 9) so that copper is deposited in the grooves on the silver electrodes (Fig. 5). Finally, the resist (28) is removed again (Fig. 6), so that the finished printed circuit board is obtained.

Cado does not disclose the feature of selective and direct treatment of the surface for producing regions of varying adhesion. In particular, the steps outlined in claim 1 of the instant application are not disclosed, because, in the present

Applic. No. 10/647,542
Amdt. dated November 14, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 14, 2006

invention as claimed, no mask is applied. Instead, the structure of the conductor track is obtained by direct treatment of the surface by regions.

Furthermore, an essential step of the instant application as claimed is that the prepared surface with the regions of varying adhesion is treated with a powder for producing the germination layer. The powder then gets stuck in the regions with higher adhesion. This type of production of the germination layer is only possible in combination with the previously performed selective treatment of the surface so that the powder particles can get stuck in the regions with higher adhesion. Cado does not disclose this limitation.

the Examiner does not identify what is considered as the germination layer in Cado. It is applicants' position that this can only be the silver layer 12 of Cado, because the copper is applied only onto the layer, which then forms the conductor track. However, the silver layer (12) is sprayed onto the entire component over large regions. A selective application does not take place there. Contrary thereto, in the present invention as claimed, the powder only gets stuck in the regions with higher adhesion.

Applic. No. 10/647,542
Amdt. dated November 14, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 14, 2006

It is a requirement for a *prima facie* case of obviousness, that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

As seen from the above-given comments, the references do not show or suggest applying a germination layer to the profile provided for the conductor run with the higher adhesion, by one of the steps of applying a powder to the surface and drawing the motor vehicle molding through a powder bath, causing the powder to only adhere to the profile provided for the conductor run, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

The Wojewnik and Wojewnik et al. references disclose that a mask is applied for producing the conductor track, where the mask has the conductor track pattern. The conductor track material is then applied by a thermal spraying. Wojewnik and Wojewnik et al. do not disclose applying a germination layer in powder form to a profile with a higher adhesion that defines the conductor runs. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, which recites applying a germination layer to the profile provided for the conductor run with the higher adhesion, by one of the steps of applying a powder to the surface and drawing the motor vehicle molding

Applic. No. 10/647,542
Amdt. dated November 14, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 14, 2006

through a powder bath, causing the powder to only adhere to the profile provided for the conductor run.

The Davis reference discloses coating of ribs without the use of mask. The construction of the ribs allows the electrical traces to be provided without a mask. Davis does not disclose applying a germination layer in powder form to a profile with a higher adhesion that defines the conductor runs. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, which recites applying a germination layer to the profile provided for the conductor run with the higher adhesion, by one of the steps of applying a powder to the surface and drawing the motor vehicle molding through a powder bath, causing the powder to only adhere to the profile provided for the conductor run.

The Cado reference discloses that the entire panel is subsequently immersed into an electrolyte bath (Fig. 9) so that copper is deposited in the grooves on the silver electrodes. Cado does not disclose applying a germination layer in powder form to a profile with a higher adhesion that defines the conductor runs. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, which recites applying a germination layer to the profile provided for the conductor run with the higher adhesion, by one of the steps of applying

Applic. No. 10/647,542
Amdt. dated November 14, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 14, 2006

a powder to the surface and drawing the motor vehicle molding through a powder bath, causing the powder to only adhere to the profile provided for the conductor run.

The references applied by the Examiner do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, it is believed that the Examiner has not produced a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, and 25-27 are solicited.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/647,542
Amdt. dated November 14, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 14, 2006

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

For Applicant(s)

AKD:cgm

November 14, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101